

### **III. REMARKS**

#### **A. Status Of Application**

Claims 1-4 and 6-15 were pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1, 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,952,990 to Inoue et al (hereinafter "Inoue"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,508 to Ono et al (hereinafter "Ono").

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,840 B1 to Huang (hereinafter "Huang").

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,728,936 to Guscott et al (hereinafter "Guscott").

Claims 7-9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Japanese Publication No. 8-35759 (A) to Chikako (hereinafter the "Chikako publication").

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue, Ono and the Chikako publication as applied to claims 1 or 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,726,676 to Callahan, Jr. et al (hereinafter "Callahan") and U.S. Patent No. 6,323,851 B1 to Nakanishi (hereinafter "Nakanishi").

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,342,901 B1 to Adler et al (hereinafter "Adler").

**B. Drawings**

The indication, in the Office Action, that the Request for Approval of Proposed Drawing Changes filed on July 30, 2002 is approved, is noted with appreciation.

A Letter to Official Draftsperson is submitted herewith.

**C. Claim Amendments**

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more clearly recite at least one of the distinguishing features of the present invention. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

**D. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections**

The rejection of claims 1, 6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Ono, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Rejected independent claim 1 has been amended to more particularly recite at least one distinguishing characteristic of the present invention, namely, that *the control section causes the display section to be reset before the driving section rewrites currently displayed information upon the timer counting to a predetermined value.*

Furthermore, independent claim 15 has been amended to more particularly recite at least one distinguishing characteristic of the present invention, namely, that the step of *resetting the liquid crystal display* is performed *upon the timer reaching a predetermined value.*

Support for these amendments exist in the Application, particularly page 35, lines 1-9, and therefore, no new matter has been added.

In contrast, Ono and Inoue fail to teach or suggest that, when a timer counts to a predetermined value, the display section is reset prior to rewriting. Thus, it is respectfully

requested that the rejection of claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Inoue patent in view of Ono, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 6 depends from and further limits independent claim 1 in a patentable sense and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Ono, be reconsidered and withdrawn as well.

#### Claim 2

The rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Huang, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 2 depends from and further limits independent claim 1 in a patentable sense and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Huang, be reconsidered and withdrawn as well.

#### Claims 3 and 4

The rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Guscott, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 in a patentable sense and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as

applied to claim 1 above and further in view of the Guscott, be reconsidered and withdrawn as well.

Claims 7-9, 12 and 13

The rejection of claims 7-9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the Chikako publication, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claims 7-9, 12 and 13 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 in a patentable sense and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claims 7-9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of the Chikako publication, be reconsidered and withdrawn as well.

Claims 10 and 11

The rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Inoue, Ono and the Chikako publication as applied to claims 1 or 7 above, and further in view of Callahan and Nakanishi, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 in a patentable sense and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue, Ono and the Chikako publication as applied to claims 1 or 7 above and further in view of Callahan and Nakanishi, be reconsidered and withdrawn as well.

Claim 14

The rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Adler, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 14 depends from and further limits independent claim 1 in a patentable sense and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, is also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue and Ono as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Adler, be reconsidered and withdrawn as well.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 15 have been amended and new claims 16-19 have been added, resulting in a total of 18 claims under consideration, of which 4 (claims 1, 15, 18, and 19) are independent claims and none include a multiple dependency. As the filing fee for the Continued Prosecution Application being concurrently submitted has been calculated in view of this Amendment, this Amendment does not incur any fee based on the number or type of claims. However, should a fee be required, please charge any fee (other than an issue fee) required during the pendency of this United States application, to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Any fee required by this document other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Roger O. Knapp

Registration No. 46,836

Attorney for Applicants

RCK/llb:bar:rb  
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Direct: (214) 981-3335  
Main: (214) 981-3300  
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400  
February 14, 2003

DA1 250072v3